

REMARKS

1. In response to the Office Action mailed January 26, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 66-103 were last presented for examination in this application. In the Office Action, claims 66-103 were rejected. By the foregoing Amendments, claims 66, 69, 72, 74, 76, 81, 84, 87, 88, 89, 91, 96, 99 and 102 have been amended. No claim have been cancelled or added. Thus, upon entry of this paper, claims 66-103 will remain pending in this application. Of these thirty-eight (38) claims, three (3) claims (claims 66, 81, and 96) are independent. Based on the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

Art of Record

2. Applicant acknowledges receipt of form PTO-892 identifying additional references made of record by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 66, 69, 72, 74, 76, 81, 84, 87, 88, 89, 91, 96, 99 and 102 have been objected to due to various informalities. Claims 66, 69, 72, 74, 76, 81, 84, 87, 88, 89, 91, 96, 99 and 102 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection to claims 66, 69, 72, 74, 76, 81, 84, 87, 88, 89, 91, 96, 99 and 102.

Claim Rejections

4. Independent claims 66, 81 and 96 and dependent claims 67-69, 80, 82-84, 95, and 97-99 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,263,290 to Williams, et al. (hereinafter, "Williams"). Dependent claims 70-78, 85-93 and 100-103 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,003,248 to Johnson (hereinafter, "Johnson"). Dependent claims 79 and 94 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Johnson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,410,617 to Kidd, et al. (hereinafter,

“Kidd”). Based on the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicant respectfully request that these rejections be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

5. Claim 66, recites, in part “store the generated pulse measurements and the at least one measurement statistic.” (See, Application, claim 66.) In rejecting, claim 66, the Examiner alleged that col. 7, lines 36-37 of Williams teaches this limitation. (See, Office Action, pp. 5-6.) Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner for at least the below discussed reasons.

6. Williams is directed to achieving highly accurate measurements for electrical waveforms. The portion of Williams relied upon by the Examiner recites, “[l]ocally synthesized data, which may be pre-stored is selected in step 31.” (See, Williams, col. 7, ll. 36-37.) This “locally synthesized data” is a synthesized ideal waveform used to view the results of different filters, and to validate the applicability of selected parameters. (See, Williams, col. 7, 44-45, col. 14, ll. 62-64.) As such, this “locally synthesized data” of Williams is neither pulse measurements nor measurement statistics. Rather, it is merely a synthesized ideal waveform.

7. The Examiner also cited to col. 12 lines 32-50 of Williams. This portion of Williams, however, does not disclose storing any data. Rather, this portion discloses sample displays that may include statistical analysis data, such as minimum values, maximum values, mean values, etc. In fact, not only does this portion fail to disclose storing any data, it doesn’t even disclose displaying pulse measurements. Thus, this portion likewise fails to disclose storing both pulse measurements and at least one measurement statistic.

8. Applicant therefore respectfully submit that Williams fails to teach or suggest “stor[ing] the generated pulse measurements and the at least one measurement statistic,” as recited by claim 66. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 66 for at least this reason.

9. Independent claim 81 recites, in part, “storing the generated at least one pulse measurement and the at least one measurement statistic.” Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that for at least similar reasons to those discussed above, independent claim 81 is likewise in condition for allowance.

10. Independent claim 96 recites, in part, “means for storing the generated at least one pulse measurement and the at least one measurement statistic.” Applicants, therefore,

respectfully submit that for at least similar reasons to those discussed above, independent claim 96 is likewise in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims

11. The dependent claims incorporate all of the subject matter of their respective independent claims and add additional subject matter which makes them *a fortiori* independently patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejections of the dependent claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

12. In view of the foregoing, this application should be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Verga', is written over a horizontal line.

Michael G. Verga
Reg. No. 39,410

April 3, 2006